DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 294 HE 012 793

AUTHOR Cesa, Thomas A.
TITLE Undergraduate Leavers and Persisters at Berkeley: Results of a Telephone Survey Conducted in Spring 1979.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 80
NOTE 55p.: Based on a speech presented at the Annual Conference of the California Association for Institutional Research (10th)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Persistence; *College Freshmen; *College Transfer Students; Comparative Analysis; *Dropout Characteristics; Followup Studies; Higher Education; Institutional Research; School Holding Power; School Surveys; Statistical Analysis; *Student Attrition; Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

Results of a 1979 telephone survey of undergraduate leavers and persisters and the University of California, Berkeley campus are presented. One hundred and fifty new freshmen and new junior transfer students entering in the fall quarter of 1977 who were not enrolled by winter quarter 1979 or had not graduated were surveyed and compared to 56 students who did not leave. Students admitted with some of the usual entrance requirements waived were also studied. A high proportion of students with grade point averages of less than 2.00 on a 4.00 scale cited their poor academic performance as a reason for leaving. The main reason stated for leaving, across all leavers, was a lack of motivation. Most of those who left became students elsewhere, with the majority transferring to a community college. Of those who left to become employed, seven out of ten became fully employed and half considered themselves full-time permanent employees. There were many response similarities between the leavers who entered as freshmen and those who entered as juniors. Suggestions for decreasing attrition are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas A. Cleaver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of a telephone survey done at the UC Berkeley campus in spring 1979 of 150 new freshmen and new junior transfer students entering in the fall quarter of 1977 who were not enrolled (and had not graduated) by winter quarter 1979, five quarters after entry. To assist in the interpretation of the results, a comparable group of 56 students who did not leave were also surveyed. In addition, students admitted with some of the usual entrance requirements waived (special action students) were studied.

The main results pertain to the leavers in general. The last quarter gpa for four out of ten leavers was less than 2.00 (A=4.0). A high proportion of those students cited their poor academic performance as a reason for leaving. However, the main reason stated for leaving, across all leavers, was a lack of motivation. Forty percent of the leavers consulted no one about leaving. Most of the leavers were last enrolled in the spring quarter. Even though the leavers were not in attendance as long as the stayers, they seemed to use disproportionately less the tutoring facilities and the faculty in an advisory capacity.

Most of those who left became students elsewhere, with the majority transferring to a community college. Many transferred to the California State Universities and Colleges system or to another UC campus. Of those who left to become employed, seven out of ten became fully employed and half considered themselves full-time permanent employees. About four out of ten leavers planned to return to Berkeley.

Even though only twelve special action leavers were interviewed, they deserve special attention because of the high proportion of underrepresented minority students within this group. Ten left with a gpa less than 2.0, and eight of these were dismissed on academic grounds. In spite of their academic record, five planned on returning to UCB. Fewer of the special action students left in the fall of 1977 than of the regular admits, and more lasted to the spring quarter. Eleven consulted no one about their decision to leave, and the same number did not consult their faculty advisors. On the other hand, ten visited and rated as helpful Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) counselors. Many special action leavers used the services of the Financial Aid Office and Student Learning Center, and virtually all who used these services reported them as being helpful. After leaving, very few special action students

became students again, and most became employed -- just the opposite pattern of the regularly admitted freshmen.

There were many response similarities between the leavers who entered as freshmen and those who entered as juniors. These two groups answered many of the interview questions in a similar manner. Also, the percent with a cumulative and last quarter gpa less than 2.00 is the same for both groups.

Most of the response differences between freshmen and juniors are explainable as a result of either class standing or by the seeming tendency for juniors to be less participatory in campus activities. An example of the former is that more juniors have majors because it is necessary to declare a major before or during the junior year. Examples of the latter are that they don't use student services as much, more live off campus, fewer attend campus programs, and fewer participate in campus activities. After leaving, more became permanent, full-time employees, which suggests that they will have less of a tendency to return.

The report also reviews suggestions for decreasing attrition and comments on them in light of this survey and previous research. Possibly the most important one suggests maximizing faculty-student interaction in the first year at the University.

The display that follows summarizes in an alternative manner many of the key results.

Office of Student Affairs Research
May 14, 1980
Tom Cesa

SUMMARY OF RESULTS BY TOPIC

Groups Compared[1]	Leavers vs Persisters (Regular Admits)		Freshman Leavers Special Action vs Regular Admits		Freshman vs Junior Leavers (Regular Admits)	
Number per Group	138	38	12	88	88	50
Academic standing last qrtr (Good standing=GPA≥ 2.0 Bad standing=GPA< 2.0)	Considerably more leavers in bad standing (37% vs 3%)		Considerably more Special Action in bad standing (83% vs 37%)		About the same percentage in bad standing (37%)	
Career goals vs no goals	About the same percentage have goals (68%)		More Special Action with goals		More juniors with goals	
Faculty, advisor contact	More persisters contact faculty		Very few Special Action contact faculty		More juniors contact faculty	
Financial aid	More persisters receive aid		More Special Action receive aid		About the same receive aid	
Residence, on or off campus	More leavers off campus		More Special Action live off campus (43%)		More juniors off campus	
Post-Berkeley activity: students elsewhere or employed	Many leavers become students elsewhere (54%)		More Special Action leavers become employed (64% vs 27%)		More juniors than freshmen become employed (52% vs 28%)	
Plans, returning to Berkeley or not	38% of the leavers plan to return		45% of the Special Action plan to return		About the same percentage have plans to return (38%)	
Last quarter enrolled	16% last enrolled in fall of the first year, but most last enrolled in the spring (49%)		More Special Action last enrolled in spring		For both groups, more were last enrolled during the spring	
Reasons given for leaving	Many diverse reasons given but lack of motivation is the most frequent (33%)		For Special Action many reasons given but realized grades were poor (25%) and illness or crisis (25%) most frequent		Lack of motivation for both groups	

[1] Each comparison is limited to certain kinds of students. "Leavers vs Persisters" is based upon regularly admitted freshmen and juniors; "Special Action vs Regular Admits" is based upon freshman leavers; "Freshman vs Junior" is based upon regularly admitted leavers. Also, regularly admitted students meet the usual entrance requirements; students admitted under special action regulations have some of the entrance requirements waived.

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	i
Introduction	1
Methodology	3
Data Analysis	7
Results	9
Regularly Admitted Leavers vs. Persisters	9
Characteristics of Leavers	11
Special Action Leavers vs. Regularly Admitted Leavers	13
Freshman Leavers vs. Junior Leavers	15
Some Relationships among the Variables	16
Suggestions for Decreasing Attrition	18
References	20
Table 1. Relationship between the Subpopulation Size, Number of Persons Who Were Telephoned, and the Number of Successful Interviews for the Leavers and the Persisters	21
Table 2. Undergraduate Leavers and Persisters: Results by Class and Admission Status	22
Table 3a. Cumulative GPA by Major for Regularly Admitted Leavers	32
Table 3b. Cumulative GPA by Social and Formal Relationships with Faculty for Regularly Admitted Leavers	32
Table 3c. Cumulative GPA by Reason for Leaving for Regularly Admitted Leavers	33
Table 3d. Number of Extracurricular Activities by Cumulative GPA for Regularly Admitted Leavers	33
Table 3e. When the Student Left by Who Was Consulted about Leaving	34

INTRODUCTION

There are many reasons for studying student nonpersistence in college. Although nonpersisters may be viewed as indications of educational failure on the part of either the educational institution or the students involved, there are many instances where nonpersistence seems justified. But whether or not it is justified, many students feel considerable personal anguish when leaving college. Furthermore, nonpersistence contributes to underutilization of educational staff and facilities. Currently, interest in nonpersistence is heightened by forecasts of decreasing college enrollment during the 1980s.

At the University of California, undergraduate leavers have been studied at the level of individual campuses and across several campuses. A Systemwide Task Force on Retention and Transfer (RATS) is studying student leavers at the UCLA, UC Santa Barbara, UC Santa Cruz, UC Davis, UC Riverside, UC San Diego, UC Irvine, and UC Berkeley campuses. At UC Berkeley, the Office of Institutional Research conducted a study (Suslow, Langlois, Sumariwalla, & Walker, 1968) that analyzed student performance and attrition of the fall 1955 and fall 1960 freshman classes. Also at Berkeley, the Office of Student Affairs Research (OSAR) prepared materials in 1976 (Avis) for a study of student persistence. The present report continues OSAR's efforts to look at student leavers, and presents in more detail the results of work carried out here and reported by RATS.

Adequate exploration of the experiences of student leavers involves studying persisters as well as leavers. Since each educational institution has its unique aspects, the characteristics of leavers are better examined by comparison to persisters at the same institution than by comparisons made across universities (Pantages and Creedon, 1978). Leavers should not, however, be treated as an indivisible, monolithic group. Separate analyses, at least initially, should be made within the leaver group for those who differ with respect to entrance qualifications, or to class level upon entrance. The former category applies to the 6% of the undergraduate population admitted by special action, i.e., the normal entrance requirements are waived at least in part, and the latter category applies to the differences between freshmen and juniors.

The design and administration of the questionnaires required consideration of the subject areas from which questions would be drawn and the medium of questionnaire distribution. The questionnaires were designed to explore why students came to Berkeley and their experiences while here. In addition, the leavers questionnaire inquired about the leavers' activities subsequent to their departure and their future plans. Instead of mailing the questionnaires, lists of leavers and stayers were telephoned at home, with the interviewer reading questions and recording responses. The questionnaire was administered by telephone for these reasons: some leavers may have moved and it is quicker and easier to locate these persons by telephone, and all responses were needed within a few weeks.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects. The students studied in this report were first-time freshmen and juniors in the fall of 1977 at the University of California at Berkeley. As freshmen constitute about 62% and juniors 20% of the new undergraduate population, about 82% of the new students that fall were eligible for inclusion in this study.

Leavers were defined as students who were not in attendance five quarters later, i.e., winter 1979, with the remaining students classified as stayers. About 18.6% of the freshmen and 24.5% of the juniors were classified as leavers. These percentages are close to those generated by the 1976 RATS data for regularly admitted students, which reported about 17% of the freshmen and 23% of the juniors not in attendance five quarters later. (The slightly higher percentage of leavers in the 1977 cohort is probably due to the inclusion of special action students in this study and their exclusion from the RATS study.)

The key summary figures for the students in this survey are as follows:

	Number	Attempted to Interview	Successful Interviews	% Successful Interviews
Leavers	993	937	150	16.0
Stayers	3895	279	56	20.1

As can be seen from the above data, 150 leavers and 56 stayers constitute the primary groups from whom data were taken. The 56 leavers (993 minus 937) whom we did not attempt to interview were used by the Missing Student Project of the University Religious Council in their survey of leavers (Sullivan, 1979). Although efforts were made to contact 937 of the leavers, the stayers were sampled in a random fashion, resulting in attempts to interview 279. In this group, special efforts were made to reach subpopulations of special interest to the University, such as all Blacks and Chicanos and most special action admission students. A more complete breakdown of the data shown above is given in Table 1, where breakdowns by class level and ethnicity are included.

Representativeness of the Final Samples. The leaver and stayer samples were compared to the campus undergraduate population of fall 1977 (see below). With regard to sexual composition, females are somewhat underrepresented in both samples, but the difference between the percentage in the leaver and stayer

samples is minimal. With regard to the ethnicity of leavers, Chicanos are somewhat overrepresented in the sample, but Blacks match the population exactly. However, the ethnic composition of the stayer sample is different from that in both the campus population and in the leaver sample.

	Leavers	Stayers	Campus
Number	150	56	4692 (new freshmen and juniors)
Sex			
Male	67%	64%	58%
Female	33	36	42
Ethnicity			
Black	4	28	4
Chicano	9	28	3
White + Other	87	43	93

The effects of these differences on the validity of the survey need to be judged in view of possible different characteristics and response patterns across ethnicity. One characteristic is that in comparison to Whites, Blacks and Chicanos have a higher tendency to drop out, even when admission status is taken into account. Since the stayer sample is composed to a large extent of persons who have a greater tendency to drop out than average, comparisons made with the leaver sample will understate differences between the population of stayers and leavers. Thus, the findings reported in this study pertaining to leaver and stayer differences most likely are understated.

Survey Materials. The survey materials were developed cooperatively by a sub-group of the Systemwide Task Force with supplemental questions at UC Berkeley. This resulted in a set of common questions asked across the eight participating UC campuses, allowing for the aggregation of data. However, each campus modified the questionnaire to allow for differences between campuses, for example, in the area of student services.

The survey materials developed were:

The Leavers' Questionnaire and the Stayers' Questionnaire -- the two basic questionnaires. Copies of these questionnaires are available by contacting the Office of Student Affairs Research.

The Telephone Survey Procedures for Interviewers -- which describes how to conduct telephone interviews, reviews interview tactics, and discusses the attitude of the interviewer.

The Outcome Sheets -- forms upon which all calls that were made could be recorded. This assured recording of the most suitable time for calling back subjects difficult to reach, and allowed adequate documentation for reimbursement of telephone expenses.

The Billing Information form -- showing the number of hours worked, the number of interviews completed, and the telephone expenses.

The Name List -- containing 28 names, last current phone number, permanent address, and telephone number. The list containing these data were generated by the Information Systems Office in response to a request made by the Office of Admissions and Records.

Selection and Training of the Interviewers. Only persons with extensive experience in dealing with the public were selected as interviewers. Of the fourteen telephone interviewers employed, many were either residence hall assistants or EOP counselors. Interviewer training began with a discussion of the Project's history and intention. The Project Coordinator then reviewed all relevant materials.

Interview Procedure. The interviewer first tried to reach the leavers at the last permanent phone number. If the subject was not reached, interviewers then sought assistance from the information operator in the city of the last permanent address. If the leaver's parents were reached, they were asked for assistance in locating their offspring. If the correct telephone number was located but the interviewee was not reached, interviewers were instructed to phone back up to seven times in attempts at contact. Initially, it was thought that leavers could be best contacted after normal business hours or on weekends. But because a fair proportion of leavers were students, it was possible to reach many during normal business hours. Thus interviews were conducted from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Each interviewer began with a list of either 28 or 56 names. When those names were exhausted, the interviewer was given more names if requested. In a few cases interviewers did not appear to work through a list adequately; those lists were re-issued.

Some interviewers used the campus telephones instead of their home telephones in order to avoid paying long distance charges. This was advantageous to the project, because use of the ATSS system resulted in a reduced rate for many calls in California. Most leavers resided in California, and some were out of state. Those residing outside the continental United States were not called.

Interviewers who used the office telephones in general were paid by the hour. Those who worked at home were paid $2.50 per completed interview. It took about ten minutes to complete an interview with a cooperative subject, but because of wrong numbers and people not being home, the interviewers who worked at home averaged about two completed interviews per hour.

Less than 2% of those contacted were not cooperative. It took approximately three weeks to conduct the interviews. Initially, the Project Coordinator thought it would take less time, but the interviews were conducted partially during finals week of the spring quarter of 1978, and the student interviewers were not as prompt in completing their interviews as originally planned.

Constraints and Costs. Operating under the constraint to obtain the data as quickly as possible, it was decided to use a telephone interview as a means of collecting data. The costs associated with the survey were: $760 for the interviewers, $200 for additional telephone expenses, about $520 for computer charges, and about $80 for development and reproduction of the questionnaires and associated written materials. The total survey cost about $1,500 exclusive of regular staff time.

DATA ANALYSIS

Two issues of analysis were present in the data: how to group subjects prior to intergroup comparisons; and how to meaningfully cluster and report the many different answers that students gave to the questions.

Grouping of Subjects. The special action students were analyzed separately from the regularly admitted students because the criteria for admission of these two student groups are different. Special action admission students are deficient with regard to the normal admissions requirements. Thus their reasons for withdrawing from the University might be considerably different from those of the regularly admitted students. Only among freshmen were there special action students. Within the special action groups and the regularly admitted groups, there are large differences between the numbers of students per ethnicity. Because of this, none of the results are analyzed by ethnicity. The basic analysis consists of examining special action freshmen, regularly admitted freshmen, and regularly admitted juniors within both the leavers and persisters groups. This allows comparisons between leavers and stayers, between specially admitted and regularly admitted freshmen leavers, and between freshmen and juniors.

Recoding of Categories. A preliminary examination of the tabulations for some questions showed a few responses distributed over many categories. This would lead to interpretations based on a few or, in some instances, one individual. For this reason categories were collapsed from their original form, present on the questionnaires to the form shown in Table 2. Questions logically linked were recoded to reflect the logic. For example, the two separate questions concerning the year and quarter when a student left were combined into one item showing quarter by year.

Perhaps the single most important instance of recoding involves the answers to the question "There may have been several reasons underlying your decision to leave UC Berkeley. Can you tell me what some of these were?" This key question was recoded from a multiple response format (each subject is allowed up to three answers to the same question) to a single response format (one subject, one response). This allowed responses to be interpreted directly in terms of the numbers of subjects responding. The recoding instructions were to take the single main reason for leaving. Because this is such an important question, the categories of response to it and examples of the coding are as follows:

1. Moving to an equivalent educational institution.
   Responses coded into this category:
   --Changed major to plant science (which UCB does not have).
   --Wanted to return to Vassar.
   --Transferred to UC Santa Cruz for aesthetic reasons.
   --Personal attachments at UCLA.

2. Moving to a less formal academic environment or a more suitable situation.
   --Career opportunity opened up in the field he desired (record artist management)
   --Moved to Monterey Peninsula college...pace was slower.

3. Crisis. Physical illness. Accident. Pregnancy. Family crisis.
   --Had a baby.
   --Wife killed in automobile accident.
   --Hepatitis.
   --My father passed away and I wanted to stay with the family.

4. Financial or work.
   --Didn't have money and had to leave to work.
   --Not enough financial aid.
   --Lost job. Financial problems.
   --Wanted some time off for work experience.
   --Applied for a crane operator position for summer job and stayed for the money, $20,000 a year. Know as writer (English major) will never make that much.
   --Was in training program at an art museum and was going full time at Cal and couldn't handle both at the same time.

5. Realized academic performance not satisfactory.
   --Grades low. Too difficult.
   --Trouble in some classes.
   --Mostly academic. I didn't think I was doing as well as I wanted.

6. Specific academic complaint.
   --Felt forced to take English major--no interest in it.
   --Not satisfied with Spanish department.
   --Wanted to change major and did not get cooperation from Political Science department.
   --New coach changed program (put him on second string).

7. Lack of motivation/alienation
   --Didn't have a particular goal--wasn't happy with major.
   --Didn't see any use for degree in comparative literature.
   --I thought school was very dehumanizing. Didn't think anyone cared.
   --Rather travel.
   --No longer liked being a student.
   --Needed a break.

8. Other
   --From a small town and didn't like Berkeley (city).
   --Personal reasons. Does not want to discuss.

RESULTS

The more important results of the telephone survey, as abstracted from the more complete version (see Table 2) are summarized next. They are discussed in the following sequence: regularly admitted leavers vs. regularly admitted persisters; characteristics of leavers; special action leavers vs. regularly admitted leavers; freshmen leavers vs. junior leavers. The group of 150 leavers consists of 12 special action freshmen, 88 regular freshmen, and 50 regular juniors, while the group of 56 stayers consists of 18 special action freshmen, 14 regular freshmen, and 24 regular juniors.

Comments are needed concerning the lack of statistical tests and the many numbers reported in the results section. Statistical tests on the percent responding were not performed because some group differences that may not be statistically significant are suggestive and interesting, and, conversely, some differences that may reach statistical significance (perhaps as an artifact of the number of subjects) have no practical importance. Thus many numbers that appeared interesting were listed, and the reader may form an opinion concerning the significance of sample group differences.

REGULARLY ADMITTED LEAVERS VS. PERSISTERS

Academic Standing. Many leavers were in academic difficulty when they left, as about 37% had a last quarter gpa less than 2.00, in contrast to 3% of the stayers. This is also reflected in the fact that 11% of the leavers were dismissed, and another 16% were on probation their last quarter. Only 3% of the persisters were on probation.

Career Goals. Sixty-eight percent of both the leavers and the persisters had career goals in mind when they entered college. Of the remaining students, twice as many leavers as persisters never developed career goals (23% vs 10%).

Social and Academic Relationships. More leavers had no social (outside of class) or formal relationship with the faculty (21% vs 3%), and leavers had fewer faculty contacts (23% vs 38%).

Use of Student Services. More persisters used the following student services than leavers: the Student Learning Center, the Career Planning and Placement Center, tutoring, faculty advisors, advisors in college or department, Student Health Service, and the Financial Aid Office. Slightly more leavers than

persisters used the Counseling Center. When interpreting these results, one should remember that most leavers were on the campus for less time than the persisters at the time the questionnaire was given, and this may partially account for the results.

Financial Aid. The Financial Aid Office was used more by both freshmen and junior persisters than by their leaver counterparts. More persisters had some form of financial aid than leavers (55% vs. 41%). The most frequently cited form of financial aid was a "combination package" (22% of the leavers vs. 37% of the persisters), where several forms of aid, typically loans, fee deferments, and grants, are awarded simultaneously. Slightly more leavers than stayers had scholarships (11% vs. 5%), but more stayers than leavers had grants (11% vs. 5%).

Employment. More persisters than leavers worked (74% vs. 42%), and this was true for both freshmen (64% vs. 35%) and juniors (79% vs. 54%). Disproportionately more persisters worked on campus less than 20 hours per week than leavers (37% vs. 8%). And more leavers worked 20 hours per week or more off campus than persisters (13% vs. 5%).

Residence. More leavers lived off campus than persisters (56% vs. 45%), and this holds for both freshmen (48% vs. 29%) and juniors (72% vs. 54%).

Participation in Activities and Programs. More persisters than leavers participated in special academic programs such as honors programs, student clubs, campus programs and events, student-University committees, and extracurricular activities. But slightly more leavers than persisters were involved in either intramural or varsity sports. Note that intercollegiate athletics was not separated from intramural and recreational sports. As with the items dealing with the use of student services, these items may also reflect both time on campus and participation in the activity.

Academic Program. About 9% of both the leavers and the persisters had trouble getting into their desired major. More persisters had problems getting into desired classes than leavers (29% vs. 16%). Again, these results may have been influenced by length of association with the University.

Reasons for Choosing Berkeley. About the same percentage of leavers as persisters chose UC Berkeley for the reason of academic content or curriculum (86% vs. 82%) and for the reason of location (63% vs. 60%). But slightly more leavers than persisters chose UC Berkeley for financial reasons (10% vs. 3%) and for reasons having to do with friends or parents (11% vs 5%).

Satisfaction with Academic Performance. More persisters are satisfied with their academic performance (64% vs. 39%), and more leavers cite "lack of

interest" as a reason for their dissatisfaction with academic performance (30% vs. 3%).

Suggestions for Improving Student Services. Of the suggestions for the improvement of student services received, there appeared to be no single dominant theme. Some students suggested that the available student services need better publicity and examples relating the services to specific student problems. One student suggested placing student services publicity literature in the quarterly registration packets. Other suggestions received were to increase the staff for veterans' counseling and make financial aid deadlines more flexible. The Student Health Service received some negative and some positive comments. Some encouraged the doctors there to express more interest in the students, while others praised the services received there. Many students suggested that the services in general were satisfactory.

Suggestions Pertaining to the Academic Program or Campus Environment. Although students' comments ranged over a diversity of topics, most can be characterized as either being critical of the campus, critical of the surrounding community, or favorable to the campus. Examples of the former are to simplify pre-enrollment, make sure the bookstore is adequately and appropriately stocked at the beginning of the quarter, reduce class size, decrease academic competition, and provide better counseling about how hard classes are. Examples of comments critical of the community express concern about parking and the large number of "weirdos" on the streets. Comments favorable to the campus pertain to the academic quality, the general campus atmosphere, the caliber of students, and the total experience.

CHARACTERISTICS OF LEAVERS

When Left. Of the five quarters spanned by this study, 15% of those who left did so during or after fall 1977; 19% left during or after winter 1978; 49% left during or after spring 1978; 16% left during or after fall 1978; none reported leaving in winter 1979. As anticipated, more students leave during the spring or over the summer than at any other time.

Activities after Leaving. Of those who left, 54% gave their current occupation as student. Another 37% were currently employed. Eight percent were unemployed, and 2% listed themselves as homemakers.

Of the leavers who are currently listed as students, 32% are at either a community college or a proprietary school. Twenty-seven percent transferred to one of the California State University system campuses, 21% transferred to another UC campus, and a like percentage transferred to either a private or out-of-state educational institution.

Of those who list themselves as employed, 72% are employed full time. Fifty-four percent consider themselves permanently employed.

Plans to Return. Thirty-eight percent plan to return to Berkeley, and 41% stated they do not intend to return to UC Berkeley.

Persons Consulted Prior to Leaving. A surprising finding is that 46% of the regularly admitted students saw no one before leaving. Possibly since about half of the students do not return after summer, no one is accessible to them when the decision to leave is being made. However, this does not appear to be the case, because the percentage of student leavers who talked to no one for the nonsummer quarters -- fall 1977 and winter 1978 -- is 46% and 59%, respectively (see Table 3e). For fall 1978 the corresponding figure is somewhat lower, at 33%. Thus with the possible exception of fall 1978, it appears that whether students are on or off campus just prior to their leaving the University, about half consult with no one. Other (not reported) analyses show that friends and academic advisors were contacted by 16% of those leaving, and parents and counselors were each contacted by 10% of the leavers.

Reasons for Leaving. The most frequently stated reason for leaving was "lack of motivation/alienation." As seen in the earlier discussion of the chart explicating the coding of this question, many of the responses suggest a lack of interest, and some a kind of aimless malaise. Some seem to express a diffuse anger or resentment towards the institution. About a third left for this reason.

Next in frequency of occurrence are four responses, each with about 12% of the respondents. They are:

1) "Moving to an equivalent educational institution." Many students who chose this option are responding either to a preconceived plan that is now implementable or are responding to a change of direction in life that can be met in a more satisfactory manner elsewhere. Students who have changed their major to one that does not exist at Berkeley fit into this category. Some students have received additional funds and can go to the school of their first choice -- usually a private college or university.

2) "Moving to a less formal academic or more suitable environment." Many of these students moved to a community college, some to a vocational school. A few expressed a desire to start their own business, such as an art store.

3) "Financial." Some left not necessarily because they did not have financial aid but rather because they did not want to get into debt. Very few appear to have left because they either were denied financial aid or were not offered enough financial aid. Some lost their jobs.

4) "Realized academic performance was not satisfactory." Most students giving this reason had grades below 2.0. Some, however, felt they were low in comparison with their academic peers, and left because even though they were above a 2.0 they were not competitive within the major, as did one electrical engineering and computer science major.

Somewhat surprisingly, only about 9% of the regularly admitted students listed, as their reason for leaving, experiencing a crisis.

SPECIAL ACTION LEAVERS VS. REGULARLY ADMITTED LEAVERS

Academic Standing and Choice of Major. Freshmen admitted under the special action category fared far worse than regularly admitted freshmen, both in terms of their cumulative and last grade point averages. For example, for these two groups the percentage of students with a cumulative gpa less than 2.0 is 83% and 27%, respectively. More special action than regularly admitted freshmen had undeclared majors (100% vs. 81%). More special action leavers were dismissed than regularly admitted freshmen leavers (67% vs. 11%).

Academic Aspirations. A slightly lower percentage of special action leavers than regularly admitted leavers planned on obtaining a baccalaureate degree at the time of their entry (64% vs. 69%). But a greater percentage of the special action students aspired towards a master's degree or beyond (36% vs. 26%).

Social and Academic Relationships. Fewer special action freshmen than regular freshmen (18% vs. 38%) sought counseling from a college or department advisor. Also, only 9% of the special action students used their faculty advisor, vs. 28% of the regular freshmen. The special action students, overall, had less contact with the faculty in terms of formal or social interaction, as evinced by the percentage engaged in frequent interaction (18% vs. 20%) and the percentage not engaged at all (46% vs. 14%). There seems to be reluctance on the part of special action students to interact with their professors.

Use of Student Services. Most of the special action freshmen leavers used the Student Learning Center (82%), and most found it helpful (73%). Most also used EOP counseling (82%), and most found that service helpful as well (82%). Most of the regular leavers who used the Student Health Service found it helpful. More regularly admitted freshmen than special action freshmen attended CalSO (66% vs 50%). More special action freshmen than regular freshmen used the Financial Aid Office (82% vs. 37%), and most of both groups of users found that office helpful. All of the special action students who used the Counseling Center found it helpful.

Financial Aid and Employment. More special action freshmen leavers received financial aid of one form or another (75%) than regularly admitted freshmen (40%). They received more loans, more grants, more combination packages, but fewer scholarships. Fewer of the special action students worked (25% vs. 35%).

Residence. More special action students lived off campus than regularly admitted freshmen (58% vs. 48%).

Participation in Activities and Programs. Consistently fewer of the special action freshmen participated in student clubs, performing arts, student-University committees, and intramural sports.

Reasons for Choosing Berkeley. Fewer special action freshmen chose UC Berkeley for academic or curriculum reasons than regular freshmen (64% vs. 90%). And more chose to come here on the advice of a friend or parent (46% vs. 14%).

Comments Pertaining to Student Services and the Campus. Special action students had fewer favorable comments concerning the campus than the regularly admitted students. The special action students expressed a need for more EOP advisors and more staff in the Financial Aid Office.

Persons Consulted prior to Leaving. The special action students had a much greater tendency to contact no one upon leaving than the regularly admitted students (92% vs. 41%).

Reasons for Leaving. The special action students were more likely to leave because they realized that their academic performance was not satisfactory and because they were experiencing a crisis than the regularly admitted students.

Activities after Leaving. More special action freshmen who left became employed than the regularly admitted group (64% vs. 28%), and fewer became students elsewhere (27% vs. 66%). Of those who became students, more transferred

to either a community college or a vocational school than the regularly admitted students (67% vs. 38%). None transferred to either another UC campus or a private or out-of-state institution. Of those who became employed, most sought permanent full-time employment (71% vs. 36% of the regular freshmen).

Plans to Return. Paradoxically, more special action leavers (46%) plan on returning to Berkeley than regular leavers, even though only 17% of them had a last quarter gpa greater than 2.0

FRESHMAN LEAVERS VS. JUNIOR LEAVERS

Academic Standing. Overall, it appears as if freshmen and juniors have about the same academic record at the point of their departure from the University. About the same percentage are dismissed (11%), and about the same percentage (37%) had last quarter gpa's less than 2.0.

Choice of Major and Career Goals. Although far fewer juniors had undeclared majors than freshmen (22% vs. 81%), this is an artifact dependent upon a university regulation stating that by the junior year students must have declared a major. With regard to degree planning upon entry, slightly more freshmen than juniors planned on receiving a master's degree or beyond. On the other hand, slightly more juniors than freshmen had a career goal when they entered, and more juniors did not change their career goal.

Use of Student Services. It seems as if junior leavers do not use student services as much as do the freshmen leavers. For example, fewer juniors than freshmen used the Student Learning Center, the Student Health Service, and CalSO. However, more juniors than freshmen used their faculty advisors (46% vs. 38%), their advisors in the college or department, the department orientation, and the Financial Aid Office.

Employment. More juniors than freshmen worked (54% vs. 35%).

Residence. More juniors than freshmen lived off campus (72% vs. 48%).

Participation in Activities and Programs. Fewer juniors participated in sports and in campus programs and events.

When Left. More juniors left early. About 25% of the juniors who left did so in their first quarter here, vs. about 11% of the freshmen leaving in the corresponding quarter.

Activities after Leaving. After leaving, more juniors than freshmen became employed (52% vs. 28%), and fewer became students (32% vs. 66%). More junior leavers transferred to the California State Universities and Colleges system

than freshmen (62% vs. 19%). As to be expected, fewer juniors transferred to a community college or vocational school (8% vs. 38%). Fewer also transferred out of state or to a private school. Of those who became employed, more juniors became permanently full-time employed (57% vs. 36%). About the same proportion of freshmen as juniors plan to return to Berkeley.

Reasons for Leaving. Fewer juniors than freshmen left because of lack of motivation or because of alienation. More juniors left to attend an equivalent educational institution, and more left because of a crisis or accident. Also, more left because of a specific academic complaint.

SOME RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE VARIABLES

During the study, several interesting relationships among variables were suggested. Some of these are examined here.

GPA vs. Major. For leavers, the relationship between major and cumulative gpa is shown in Table 3a. The highest percentage of those leaving in bad standing occurs in the engineering major. Most of the humanities and fine arts majors left with a gpa above 3.0. Most of the students with an undecided major left with a gpa between 2.0 and 3.0. These results suggest that there may be a relationship between major, gpa, and the decision to leave, but comparable data on a much larger group of stayers is necessary for an adequate exploration of such a relationship.

GPA vs. Social and Academic Relationships. Table 3b shows that there is a relationship between the extent of student-faculty relationship and cumulative gpa for the regularly admitted leavers. In particular, those having a high gpa tend to socialize with the faculty more, and conversely.

GPA vs. Reason for Leaving. Table 3c shows cumulative gpa by reason for leaving for the regularly admitted students. Lack of motivation appears to be a prevalent reason for all gpa categories. But the students with a cumulative gpa less than 2.0 also give as a reason for leaving the realization that their academic performance is unsatisfactory. The group with a gpa of 3.0 or more listed as their most frequent reason for leaving moving to an equivalent educational institution. There appears to be a relationship between the reason given for leaving and cumulative gpa.

GPA vs. Extracurricular Activities. Table 3d shows that students who leave in good standing tend to have participated in more extracurricular activities than those who leave with a cumulative gpa less than 2.00

SUGGESTIONS FOR DECREASING ATTRITION

As the results of this study generally agree with the results of previous research on attrition reviewed by Pantages and Creedon (1978), their recommendations concerning reduction of attrition (pp.94-96) may have applicability to UC Berkeley as well. Their recommendations are listed along with commentaries on some of them.

1. Analyze admissions applications not only for signs of eligibility but also for potential for persistence. This recommendation requires the collection of additional personality data through either an interview or a personality test. The feasibility and policy implications of using procedures that are subjective in the admissions procedure cause one to have serious reservations about the implementation of this procedure at a public institution.

2. Apply attrition reduction measures primarily to freshmen, since they are most likely to withdraw. This conjecture is not supported by RATS data at Berkeley. It appears as if the rate of withdrawal is greater for entering juniors than for entering freshmen. The 4th quarter attrition rate for freshmen entering in the fall 1972 cohort was 16%; new juniors entering in fall 1972 had a 4th quarter attrition rate of 20%. Comparable results hold for the 1973 to 1976 cohorts.

3. Make orientation programs more comprehensive (include parents, if possible) and schedule them at critical points through the year (such as at every grading period and at the end of the term). In the orientation programs focus on attitudinal and motivational variables that contribute to attrition. It may not be practical to hold orientation programs throughout the year for all incoming students. However, it may be possible to apply the suggestions made here selectively, i.e., to special action students. Berkeley data show that about as many freshmen leave during the first three quarters of the year as across the summer and the 4th quarter (8% and 8%) for the 1972 cohort. Most likely, the 8% who left either during the summer or during the 4th quarter left during the summer. It thus appears that the summer is a critical point for freshmen. Junior leavers appear to be spread out more evenly across the first four quarters, i.e., only 5% leave either during the summer or 4th quarter. Perhaps freshmen identified as potential leavers, e.g., those in academic difficulty, could be contacted during the summer with a letter explaining services available to them.

4. Increase the publicity for counseling programs and make counseling available for faculty and parents of students. Establish an early-warning system that alerts faculty advisors to students in possible trouble. Initiatives for seeking such services should not be left entirely to the students.

5. Provide more vocational counseling and job development. Show students the connection between college experiences and the occupational and economic designations of its graduates. If vocational counseling is not part of the orientation program, perhaps it should become part of it.

6. Counsel on study habits. Several Student Affairs units currently provide services in the area of study habits.

7. Make greater use of existing college environment assessment devices to identify those environmental aspects that create student dissatisfaction. About 5% of those who left cited as their primary reason for leaving a specific academic complaint. Among the campus persons available to help the student in this area are the ombudsperson, academic advisors, advisors within certain colleges, and dormitory residence assistants.

8. Modify financial aid to include more grants and fewer loans. The feasibility of this suggestion is extremely complex to analyze.

9. Experiment with modification of dormitory "atmosphere" and increase the exposure of freshmen to upper classmen. The first part of this suggestion appears to be too vague to be of much use. There may be some merit in the second part of the suggestion, in terms of having upper classmen peer tutor or advise lower classmen.

10. Maximize faculty-student interaction, especially during the first year for freshmen and transfer students. Increase faculty involvement in orientation.

11. Make follow-up questionnaires mandatory for those students who withdraw from college.

These recommendations are listed briefly because most appear to be either implemented to the extent practical or involve a trade-off deemed unacceptable under present policy and financial conditions. In addition, some suggestions appear to infringe on the sense of responsibility that students should be developing. Another consideration is that a certain proportion of those who leave do so for good reasons, e.g., temporary crisis or transfer to an equivalent educational institution.

REFERENCES

Avis, J. An introduction for the study of student persistence at Berkeley. Office of Student Affairs Research, March 1976.

Pantages, T.J., & Creedon, C.F. Studies of college attrition: 1950-1975. Review of Educational Research, 1978, 48(1), 49-101.

Sullivan, J.B. Antecedents and consequences of leaving college at UC Berkeley: Final research report, 1978-1979. Missing Student Project, The University Religious Council, University of California, Berkeley, September 15, 1979.

Suslow, S., Langlois, E., Sumariwalla, R.,& Walther, R. Student performance and attrition at the University of California, Berkeley: A follow-up of the entering freshman class of fall 1955 and fall 1960. Office of Institutional Research, University of California, Berkeley, California, January 1968.

Table 1. Relationship between the Subpopulation Size, Number of Persons Who Were Telephoned, and the Number of Successful Interviews for the Leavers and the Persisters.

	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
Category	N in Population	Attempted to Interview	Successful Interview	% Successful Interview	N in Population	Attempted to Interview	Successful Interview	% Successful Interview
Freshman Special Action Black	27	27	3	11.1	30	30	8	26.6
Freshman Special Action Chicano	3	3	2	66.7	15	15	4	26.6
Freshman Special Action Other	40	40	7	17.5	116	33	6	18.1
Freshman Regular Black	20	20	1	5.0	62	34	5	14.7
Freshman Regular Chicano	16	16	7	43.7	24	24	5	20.8
Freshman Regular Other	544	516	80	15.5	2592	25	4	16.0
Freshman Subtotal	650	622	100	16.1	2839	161	32	19.9
Junior Special Action Black	1	1	0	0.0	0	0	0	---
Junior Special Action Chicano	0	0	0	---	0	0	0	---
Junior Special Action Other	0	0	0	---	3	3	0	0.0
Junior Regular Black	14	14	2	14.3	33	33	3	9.1
Junior Regular Chicano	8	8	4	50.0	22	22	7	31.8
Junior Regular Other	320	292	44	15.1	998	60	14	23.3
Junior Subtotal	343	315	50	15.9	1056	118	24	20.3
Total	993	937	150	16.0	3895	279	56	20.1
Category								
Subtotals from above								
Special Action	71	71	12	16.9	164	81	18	22.2
Regular	922	866	138	15.9	3731	198	38	19.2
Black	62	62	6	9.6	125	97	16	16.5
Chicano	27	27	13	48.1	61	61	16	26.2
Other	904	848	131	15.4	3709	121	24	19.8
Freshman	650	662	100	16.1	2839	161	32	19.9
Junior	343	315	50	15.9	1056	118	24	20.3

Table 2. Undergraduate Leavers and Persisters: Results by Class and Admission Status

Item	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total
Number	12	88	50	138	18	14	24	38
Sex								
Female	33.3	25.0	48.0	34.5	22.2	50.0	37.5	42.1
Male	66.7	75.0	52.0	65.5	77.8	50.0	62.5	57.9
Last GPA								
3.0-4.0	16.7	34.9	41.7	37.3	44.4	35.7	70.8	57.9
2.0-2.9	0.0	27.9	20.8	25.4	44.4	64.3	25.0	39.5
0.0-1.9	83.3	37.2	37.5	37.3	11.1	0.0	4.2	2.6
Cumulative GPA								
3.0-4.0	8.3	26.1	40.8	31.4	11.1	50.0	50.0	50.0
2.0-2.9	8.3	46.6	34.7	42.3	77.8	50.0	50.0	50.0
0.0-1.9	83.3	27.3	24.5	26.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Major								
Engineering or Natural Resources	0.0	11.4	10.2	10.9	11.1	7.1	16.7	13.1
Physical or Biological Science	0.0	1.1	20.4	8.0	5.6	0.0	12.5	7.9
Social Science	0.0	2.3	20.4	8.8	0.0	0.0	50.0	31.6
Humanities or Fine Arts	0.0	0.0	24.5	8.8	0.0	0.0	16.7	10.5
Natural Resources	0.0	4.5	2.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undecided	100.0	80.7	22.4	59.8	83.3	92.9	4.2	36.8
Academic Standing								
Dismissal	66.7	11.4	10.0	10.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation	16.7	12.5	20.0	15.0	5.6	0.0	4.2	2.6
Satisfactory	16.7	76.1	70.0	74.0	94.4	100.0	95.8	97.4

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total
Ethnicity								
Black	25.0	1.1	4.0	2.2	44.4	35.7	12.5	21.0
Chicano	16.7	8.0	8.0	10.0	22.2	35.7	29.2	31.6
White or Other	41.7	88.6	84.0	87.0	25.0	28.6	58.3	47.4
Highest Degree Planned When Entering								
None	0.0	5.8	4.1	5.2	0.0	7.1	0.0	2.6
Baccalaureate	63.6	68.6	75.5	71.1	72.2	50.0	70.8	63.2
Masters or Beyond	36.4	25.6	20.4	23.7	27.8	42.9	29.2	34.2
Career Goal When Entered								
No	27.3	32.9	26.5	30.6	33.3	28.6	33.3	31.6
Yes	72.7	67.1	73.5	68.7	66.7	71.4	66.7	68.4
Did You Develop or Change Career Goal?								
Never Developed	9.1	24.7	20.4	23.1	5.6	7.1	12.5	10.5
No Change in Goal	72.7	32.9	44.9	37.3	44.4	50.0	54.2	52.6
Developed or Changed	18.2	40.0	32.7	37.3	38.9	42.9	29.2	34.2
Goal Lost	0.0	1.2	2.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	1.2	0.0	.7	11.1	0.0	4.2	2.6
Relationship with Faculty								
Frequent	18.2	20.0	29.2	23.3	33.3	28.6	43.5	37.8
Limited	36.4	65.9	37.5	55.6	61.1	71.4	52.2	59.5
None	45.5	14.1	33.3	21.1	5.6	0.0	4.3	2.7
Rating of Student Learning Center								
Helpful	72.7	23.3	14.3	20.0	72.2	46.2	16.7	26.3
Not Helpful	9.1	4.7	2.0	3.7	5.6	7.7	25.0	10.5
No Knowledge	0.0	2.3	2.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	18.2	69.8	81.6	74.1	22.2	46.2	58.3	63.2

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total
Rating of Career Planning & Placement								
Helpful	18.2	16.2	16.7	16.4	27.8	7.1	37.5	26.3
Not Helpful	0.0	4.7	4.2	4.5	0.0	7.1	12.5	10.5
No Knowledge	0.0	1.2	0.0	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	81.8	77.9	79.2	78.4	72.2	85.7	50.0	63.2
EOP Counseling								
Helpful	81.8	11.8	6.3	9.8	50.0	28.6	16.7	21.0
Not Helpful	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Knowledge	0.0	3.5	2.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	18.2	84.7	91.7	87.2	44.4	71.4	83.3	78.9
Tutoring								
Helpful	0.0	7.1	2.1	5.3	22.2	35.7	4.2	15.8
Not Helpful	0.0	1.2	0.0	.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Knowledge	0.0	2.4	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	100.0	89.4	97.9	92.5	77.8	64.3	95.8	84.2
Faculty Advisors								
Helpful	9.1	12.8	31.3	19.4	27.8	14.3	50.0	36.8
Not Helpful	0.0	9.3	22.9	14.2	11.1	7.1	20.8	15.8
No Knowledge	0.0	5.8	6.3	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	81.8	62.4	54.2	59.4	38.9	78.6	29.2	47.4

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total
Advisors in College or Department								
Helpful	18.2	24.7	41.7	30.8	50.0	28.6	58.3	47.4
Not Helpful	0.0	8.2	4.2	6.8	11.1	7.1	8.3	7.9
No Knowledge	0.0	4.7	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	81.8	62.4	54.2	59.4	38.9	64.3	33.3	44.7
CALSO								
Helpful	50.0	56.5	33.3	48.1	66.7	57.1	29.2	39.5
Not Helpful	0.0	7.1	2.1	5.3	0.0	7.1	4.2	5.3
No Knowledge	0.0	2.4	2.1	2.2	5.6	0.0	4.2	2.6
Didn't Use	50.0	34.1	62.5	44.4	27.8	35.7	62.5	52.6
Department Orientation								
Helpful	9.1	11.8	16.7	13.5	16.7	14.3	20.8	18.4
Not Helpful	0.0	2.4	10.4	5.3	0.0	7.1	4.2	5.3
No Knowledge	0.0	9.4	6.3	8.3	0.0	21.4	0.0	7.9
Didn't Use	90.9	76.5	66.7	72.9	83.3	57.1	75.0	68.4
Student Health Service								
Helpful	9.1	44.7	40.8	43.3	61.1	61.5	58.3	59.4
Not Helpful	18.2	4.7	8.2	6.0	11.1	0.0	8.3	5.4
No Knowledge	0.0	1.2	0.0	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	72.7	49.4	51.0	50.0	27.8	38.5	33.3	35.1
Financial Aid Office								
Helpful	81.8	33.7	40.8	36.2	83.3	50.0	54.2	52.6
Not Helpful	0.0	2.3	14.3	6.6	5.6	14.3	8.3	10.5
No Knowledge	0.0	1.2	0.0	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	18.2	62.8	44.9	56.2	11.1	35.7	37.5	36.8
Counseling Center								
Helpful	18.2	7.3	10.6	8.5	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not Helpful	0.0	6.1	2.1	4.6	0.0	0.0	12.5	7.9
No Knowledge	0.0	1.2	2.1	1.5	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	81.8	85.4	85.1	85.2	88.9	100.0	87.5	92.1

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total
Psychiatry Center								
Helpful	0.0	1.2	2.2	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not Helpful	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	7.1	0.0	2.6
No Knowledge	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Didn't Use	100.0	93.9	97.8	95.3	100.0	92.9	100.0	97.4
Did You Receive Financial Aid								
Loan	8.3	2.3	8.0	4.5	0.0	7.1	0.0	2.6
Grant	33.3	3.4	10.0	6.0	22.2	14.3	8.3	10.5
Combination	33.3	20.5	20.0	20.3	61.1	14.3	50.0	36.8
None	25.0	60.2	58.0	59.4	5.6	57.1	37.5	44.7
Scholarship	0.0	13.6	4.0	10.4	11.1	7.1	4.2	5.3
Did You Work While a Student?								
On Campus<20 Hours	16.7	5.7	12.0	7.9	16.7	35.7	37.7	36.8
On Campus≥20 Hours	0.0	3.4	2.0	2.8	5.6	7.1	4.2	5.3
Off Campus<20 Hours	0.0	13.6	20.0	15.9	0.0	21.4	20.8	21.0
Off Campus≥20 Hours	0.0	12.5	14.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	5.3
None	75.0	64.8	46.0	57.9	55.6	35.7	20.8	26.3
Work/Study	8.3	0.0	2.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.6
Combination	0.0	0.0	4.0	1.4	22.2	0.0	4.2	2.6
Did You Live in Campus Housing?								
Frat-Sorority	0.0	6.8	2.0	5.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Residence Hall	33.3	36.4	20.0	30.4	44.4	57.1	29.2	39.4
Other Campus	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	5.2
More than One	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	58.3	47.7	72.0	56.5	27.8	28.6	54.2	44.7
Co-op Housing	8.3	6.8	4.0	5.7	11.1	14.3	8.3	10.5
Participated in:								
Special Academic Program	0.0	4.5	2.0	3.6	16.7	21.4	16.7	18.4
Student Clubs	8.3	17.0	22.0	19.5	27.8	50.0	50.0	50.0
Performing Arts	0.0	5.7	6.0	5.8	11.1	7.1	4.2	5.2
Intramurals-Sports	25.0	34.1	22.0	30.8	55.6	35.7	20.8	26.3

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS Special Action Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Juniors	LEAVERS Regular Total	PERSISTERS Special Action Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Juniors	PERSISTERS Regular Total
Participated in:								
Campus Programs-Events	58.3	77.3	48.0	69.1	83.3	92.9	75.0	81.5
Student-University Committees	0.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	0.0	7.1	20.8	15.7
Other Extracurricular	0.0	3.4	2.0	3.0	16.7	14.3	4.2	7.8
Problems Getting into Desired Courses								
None	75.0	81.8	88.0	84.0	66.7	42.9	87.5	71.0
Some	25.0	18.2	12.0	16.0	33.3	57.1	12.5	29.0
Problems Getting into Desired Major								
None	91.7	64.8	76.0	68.8	38.9	50.0	91.7	76.3
Some	0.0	4.5	20.0	10.1	5.6	7.1	8.3	7.8
Undeclared Major	8.3	30.7	4.0	21.0	55.6	42.9	0.0	15.7
Attitude of UCB Faculty toward Minorities	(N=4	=13	=9	=22)	(N=9	=10	=9	=19)
Positive	75.0	46.2	55.6	50.0	33.3	20.0	11.1	15.7
Mixed	0.0	15.4	0.0	9.0	33.3	40.0	22.2	31.5
Neutral	25.0	38.5	33.3	36.3	33.3	30.0	44.4	36.8
Negative	0.0	0.0	11.1	4.5	0.0	10.0	22.2	15.7
Attitude of Students toward Minorities	(N=4	=13	=10	=23)	(N=9	=10	=8	=18)
Positive	50.0	23.1	60.0	39.1	33.3	20.0	12.5	16.6
Mixed	0.0	53.8	0.0	30.4	11.1	40.0	12.5	27.7
Neutral	50.0	23.1	30.0	26.0	33.3	30.0	37.5	33.3
Negative	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.3	22.2	10.0	37.5	22.2
Attitude of Staff toward Minorities	(N=4	=13	=8	=21)	(N=9	=10	=9	=19)
Positive	75.0	23.1	62.5	38.0	22.2	30.0	0.0	15.7
Mixed	0.0	.3.1	0.0	14.2	33.3	30.0	22.2	26.3
Neutral	25.0	53.8	37.5	47.6	44.4	40.0	77.8	57.8
Negative	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS				PERSISTERS			
	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total	Special Action Freshmen	Regular Freshmen	Regular Juniors	Regular Total
Anything Else Want to Comment about UC Experience								
Complimentary	8.3	19.7	20.0	19.8	22.2	21.5	16.7	19.1
Occasional Complaint	0.0	2.4	4.0	3.0	5.5	7.2	8.4	7.8
Critical of Faculty or Students	0.0	6.3	12.0	8.4	0.0	0.0	8.4	4.2
Comment on City	0.0	2.4	4.0	3.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Critical of Service	0.0	4.7	0.0	3.0	5.5	7.2	0.0	3.6
Personal Complaint	0.0	5.5	0.0	3.5	5.5	14.3	16.7	15.5
No Additional Comment	91.7	59.0	60.0	59.0	55.5	50.0	50.0	50.0
Reason for Choosing UCB over Others	(N=11	=79	=49	=128)	(N=18	=14	=24	=28)
Academic or Curriculum	63.6	89.9	79.6	85.9	77.8	71.4	87.5	81.6
Location	36.4	65.8	59.2	63.3	55.6	85.7	45.8	60.5
Financial	9.1	8.9	12.2	10.2	16.7	7.1	0.0	2.6
Friend/Parent	45.5	13.9	6.1	10.9	0.0	7.1	4.2	5.3
Why Dissatisfied with Academic Performance	(N=9	=78	=45	=123)	(N=13	=12	=21	=33)
Satisfied with Performance	33.3	37.2	42.2	39.0	46.2	58.3	66.7	63.6
Academic Difficulty	33.3	39.7	46.7	42.3	53.8	41.7	33.3	36.3
Lack of Interest	33.3	29.5	31.0	30.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	3.0
Improvements to Services Listed	(N=11	=41	=23	=64)	(N=10	=8	=16	=24)
Publicize	0.0	26.8	8.7	20.3	30.0	12.5	12.5	12.5
More Individual Asst.	28.6	12.2	17.4	14.1	10.0	12.5	6.3	8.4
Academic Advising	28.6	26.8	39.1	31.2	0.0	0.0	12.5	8.3
Better Information	0.0	12.5	0.0	8.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	4.2
Better Staff	0.0	22.0	30.4	25.0	20.0	25.0	37.5	33.3
Decrease Bureaucracy	28.6	12.2	13.0	12.5	40.0	25.0	31.3	29.2
Improve Student Health Service	28.6	4.9	4.3	4.7	10.0	25.0	12.5	16.7

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS Special Action Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Juniors	LEAVERS Regular Total	PERSISTERS Special Action Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Juniors	PERSISTERS Regular Total
Changes to Acad. Program or Campus	(N=6	=56	=39	=95)	(N=13	=12	=17	=29)
More Personalized Atmosphere	0.0	14.3	10.3	12.6	7.7	0.0	5.9	3.4
More Relevant Coursework	33.3	21.4	15.4	18.9	15.4	50.0	23.5	34.5
More Student-Faculty Contact	0.0	28.6	20.5	25.3	30.8	33.3	11.8	20.7
More Personal Advising	16.7	12.5	15.4	13.7	0.0	8.3	11.8	10.3
Increase Learning Emphasis	0.0	3.6	5.1	4.2	0.0	16.7	0.0	6.9
Improve Quality of Instruction	16.7	8.9	20.5	13.7	7.7	8.3	11.8	10.3
Alter Grading	0.0	3.6	0.0	2.1	7.7	0.0	11.8	6.9
Financial	32.3	3.6	12.8	7.4	7.7	0.0	5.9	3.4
Make Pre-Enrollment More Efficient	0.0	3.6	2.6	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dislike Quarter System	16.7	0.0	2.6	1.1	0.0	0.0	11.8	6.9
Dislike City of Berk.	0.0	7.1	2.6	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Slower Pace	0.0	1.8	2.6	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Decrease Congestion	0.0	1.8	7.7	4.2	15.4	0.0	5.9	3.4
Personal	0.0	3.6	10.3	6.4	7.7	0.0	5.9	3.4
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	8.3	5.9	6.9
Reasons for Staying at UC	θ	θ	θ	θ	(N=17	=14	=23	=27)
Close to Home					0.0	21.4	0.0	8.1
Coursework Interesting or Satisfying					23.5	35.7	34.8	35.1
Intellectual Climate					70.6	35.7	52.2	45.9
Student-Faculty Relations					0.0	0.0	4.3	2.7
Social Atmosphere					17.6	14.3	17.4	16.2
Extracurricular Activities					11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Major Related to Career Goals					5.9	7.1	13.0	10.7
Easier Not to Transfer					0.0	14.3	0.0	5.4
Other					11.8	7.1	17.4	13.5
Degree and Educational Goals								
Plan to Complete a Degree at UCB					94.4	85.7	100.0	94.7
Plan to Transfer Instead					0.0	7.1	0.0	2.6
Other					5.6	7.1	0.0	2.6

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS Special Action Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Juniors	LEAVERS Regular Total	PERSISTERS Special Action Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Juniors	PERSISTERS Regular Total
Last Enrolled								
Fall 1977	9.1	10.6	24.5	15.7				
Winter 1978	27.3	17.6	22.4	19.3				
Spring 1978	63.6	55.3	38.8	49.3				
Fall 1978	0.0	16.5	14.3	15.7				
Current Occupation								
Student	27.3	66.3	32.0	53.8				
Employed	63.6	27.7	52.0	36.6				
Unemployed	9.1	6.0	12.0	8.2				
Homemaker	0.0	0.0	4.0	1.5				
For Students: Where Transferred	(N=3	=53	=13	=66)				
Community College or Vocational School	66.7	37.7	7.7	31.8				
Cal State University	33.3	18.9	61.5	27.3				
Other UC Campuses	0.0	20.8	23.1	21.2				
Private or Out of State	0.0	22.6	7.7	19.7				
For Those Employed	(N=7	=22	=28	=50)				
Permanent Full Time	71.4	36.4	57.1	48.0				
Permanent Part Time	0.0	4.5	7.1	5.9				
Temporary Full Time	14.3	31.8	17.9	24.0				
Temporary Part Time	14.3	27.3	17.9	22.0				
Plans to Return to UCB	(N=11	=86	=50	=136)				
No or Attend Another College	14.8	41.6	40.0	41.0				
Plan to Return to UCB	45.5	38.4	38.0	38.2				
Graduated	0.0	0.0	8.0	2.9				
Don't Know	18.2	19.8	14.0	17.7				

Table 2. (Continued)

Item	LEAVERS Special Action Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Freshmen	LEAVERS Regular Juniors	LEAVERS Regular Total	PERSISTERS Special Action Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Freshmen	PERSISTERS Regular Juniors	PERSISTERS Regular Total
Whom Consulted about Leaving	(N=12	=88	=50	=138)				
No One	91.7	40.9	56.0	46.4				
Parents	0.0	5.7	6.0	5.8				
Friends	0.0	5.7	8.0	6.5				
Faculty	0.0	1.1	2.0	1.4				
Administrator	8.3	2.3	0.0	1.4				
Academic Advisor	0.0	8.0	6.0	7.3				
Counselor	0.0	10.2	4.0	7.9				
Other	0.0	3.4	6.0	4.3				
None of the Above	0.0	22.7	12.0	18.8				
Single Main Reason for Leaving	(N=12	=88	=49	=137)				
Moving to Equivalent Educ. Institution	0.0	10.2	14.3	11.7				
Moving to Less Formal Academic Environment	8.3	14.8	8.2	12.4				
Crisis: Physical Illness or Accident, or Family Death or Illness	25.0	5.7	14.3	8.8				
Financial	8.3	13.6	14.3	13.8				
Realized Academic Performance not Satisfactory	25.0	11.4	10.2	10.9				
Specific Academic Complaint	0.0	2.3	10.2	5.1				
Lack of Motivation/ Alienation	16.7	37.5	24.5	32.8				
Other	8.3	2.3	4.1	2.9				
Blank	8.3	2.3	0.0	1.5				

Table 3a. Cumulative GPA by Major for Regularly Admitted Leavers

		Major					
		Engineering	Science (Biol. or Phys.)	Social Science	Humanities & Fine Arts	Undecided	Natural Resources
	N/N	15	11	12	12	81	5
Cumulative GPA							
0.0 - 1.9	42	40.0	36.4	25.0	16.7	24.7	20.0
2.0 - 2.9	58	46.7	36.4	25.0	25.0	46.9	60.0
3.0 - 4.0	36	13.3	27.3	50.0	58.3	28.4	20.0
Total	136						

Table 3b. Cumulative GPA by Social and Formal Relationships with Faculty for Regularly Admitted Leavers

		Faculty Relationships		
	N/N	Frequent	Limited	None
		31	74	27
Cumulative GPA				
0.0 - 1.9	43	16.1	24.3	33.3
2.0 - 2.9	57	32.3	47.3	44.4
3.0 - 4.0	32	51.6	28.4	22.2
Total	132			

Table 3c. Cumulative GPA by Reason for Leaving for Regularly Admitted Leavers

Cumulative GPA	N	Reason for Leaving: Transfer to Equivalent Educ. Instit.	Lower Academic Aspirations	Crisis: Physical Illness or Family	Financial	Realized Acad. Perf. Unsatisf.	Specific Academic Complaint	Lack of Motivation/ Alienation	Other	Blank
0.0 - 1.9	36	5.6	8.3	11.1	8.3	25.0	5.6	30.6	0.0	5.6
2.0 - 2.9	57	3.5	14.0	7.0	17.5	8.8	5.3	38.6	5.3	0.0
3.0 - 4.0	43	27.9	14.0	9.3	14.0	2.3	4.7	25.6	2.3	0.0
Total/ Average	136	11.8	12.5	8.8	14.0	11.0	5.2	32.4	3.0	1.5

Table 3d. Number of Extracurricular Activities by Cumulative GPA for Regularly Admitted Leavers

Cumulative GPA	Number	Number of Extracurricular Activities: 0	1	2	3	4
0.0 - 1.9	36	33.3	33.3	19.4	13.9	0.0
2.0 - 2.9	58	27.6	41.4	24.1	6.9	0.0
3.0 - 4.0	43	16.3	32.6	25.6	20.9	4.7
Total/ Average	137	25.6	36.5	23.4	13.1	1.5

Table 3e. When the Student Left by Who Was Consulted about Leaving

When Left	Number	No One	Parents	Friend	Faculty	Administrative	Acad. Adv.	Counselor	Other	More than One
Fall 1977	22	45.5	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	27.3
Wint 1978	29	58.6	10.3	3.4	0.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	6.9	10.3
Spring 1978	73	50.7	2.7	9.6	1.4	2.7	8.2	..5	2.7	16.4
Fall 1978	21	33.3	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	14.3	9.5	9.5	19.0
Total/ Average	145	49.0	5.5	6.2	1.4	2.1	6.9	7.6	4.1	17.2